

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are presently active in this case, Claim 16 having been amended by way of the present Amendment. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 18, and 20-22 have been allowed. Claims 2, 6, 8, 19, and 23 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Withdrawn Claim 2, 6, 8, and 19 depend from allowed base Claim 1, and thus the Applicants request rejoinder and allowance of Claims 2, 6, 8, and 19.

The Applicants respectfully request the entry of the amendment set forth herein as they are believed to clearly place the application into condition for allowance.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-32131 in view of Iacovangelo (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,694). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-32131 in view of Wallace et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,944). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-32131 in view of Wallace et al. and Nakata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,286,134). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-32131 in view of Iacovangelo and Nakata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,615). For the reasons discussed below, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

The basic requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness as set forth in MPEP 2143 include (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, (2) there must be a reasonable

expectation of success, and (3) the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established in the present case because the cited references, either taken singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent Claim 16.

Claim 16 of the present application advantageously recites a temperature detecting unit comprising a temperature detecting sensor, a window member, a frame which holds the window member, and an airflow unit that provides a unidirectional curtain of airflow parallel to and along a surface of the window member between an object and the temperature detecting sensor. (See, e.g., page 10, paragraph [0046]; pages 12-13, paragraph [0054]; Figure 10; and Figure 14.) The Applicants respectfully submit that the references, either taken singularly or in combination, teach or suggest all of the above limitations.

The Official Action cites the JP 64-32131 reference for the teaching of the airflow unit recited in Claim 16 of the present application. The JP 64-32131 reference depicts and describes an infrared sensor (15) mounted on a circuit board of a microwave oven that is heated by conduction and radiation of heat (19) from a heating part and cooled with an air blast (20). The infrared sensor (15) is mounted within a package (11) that includes a window (12).

As noted in the Abstract, the air blast (20) is provided in order to cool the infrared sensor (15). Figure 1 of the JP 64-32131 reference depict the air blast (20) as three wavy lines directed towards a side surface of heat insulating cap (18). The JP 64-32131 reference clearly does not include an airflow unit that provides a unidirectional curtain of airflow parallel to and along a surface of a window member, as recited in Claim 16 of the present

application. The wavy lines of air blast (20) of the JP 64-32131 reference clearly do not depict a unidirectional curtain of airflow that is parallel to and along a surface of the window (12). The three wavy lines of the air blast (20) are directed towards a side surface of heat insulating cap (18) and not along a surface of the window (12). Furthermore, when the air blast (20) contacts the side surface of the cap (18), then the blast of air will be deflected in a multi-directional manner that is not along a surface of the window (12). Thus, the Applicants submit that the JP 64-32131 reference does not disclose an airflow unit that provides a unidirectional curtain of airflow parallel to and along a surface of the window member, as recited in Claim 16 of the present application.

Additionally, the Applicants submit that the Iacovangelo reference does not supplement the deficiencies of the JP 64-32131 reference discussed above. More specifically, the Iacovangelo reference does not disclose an airflow unit that provides a unidirectional curtain of airflow parallel to and along a surface of the window member, as recited in Claim 16 of the present application. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the combination of the JP 64-32131 reference and the Iacovangelo reference does not render Claim 16 obvious, since the cited references, either taken singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent Claim 16.

Furthermore, the Applicants submit that the Wallace et al. reference does not supplement the deficiencies of the JP 64-32131 reference discussed above. More specifically, the Wallace et al reference does not disclose an airflow unit that provides a unidirectional curtain of airflow parallel to and along a surface of the window member, as recited in Claim 16 of the present application. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the combination of the JP 64-32131 reference and the Wallace et al reference does not render

Application Serial No.: 10/618,587  
Reply to Office Action dated March 24, 2005

Claim 16 obvious, since the cited references, either taken singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent Claim 16.


Thus, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claim 16.

Claim 17 is considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claim 16, from which it depends.

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf

I:\atty\cdw\24xxxx\240443US3\am2.doc